Working Papers in Educational Linguistics (WPEL)

Volume 13
Number 2 *Fall 1997*

Article 1

10-1-1997

Language Policy, Language Education and Language Rights: Indigenous, Immigrant, and International Perspectives

Nancy H. Hornberger
University of Pennsylvania

Language Policy, Language Education and Language Rights: Indigenous, Immigrant, and International Perspectives

Language Policy, Language Education, and Language Rights: Indigenous, Immigrant, and International Perspectives[1]

Nancy H. Hornberger

University of Pennsylvania
Plenary talk presented at the Annual Conference of the American Association for Applied Linguistics
Orlando, Florida
8 March 1997

Abstract

Indigenous languages are under siege, not only in the United States but around the world, in danger of disappearing because they are not being transmitted to the next generation. Immigrants and their languages worldwide are similarly subjected to seemingly irresistible social, political, and economic pressures. Yet, at a time when phrases like "endangered languages" and "linguicism" are invoked to describe the plight of the world's vanishing linguistic resources in their encounter with the phenomenal growth of world languages such as English, there is also consistent and compelling evidence that language policy and language education serve as vehicles for promoting the vitality, versatility and stability of these languages, and ultimately of the rights of their speakers to participate in the global community on, and *in*, their own terms.

Language Policy, Language Education, and Language Rights:Indigenous, Immigrant, and International Perspectives

Just over a month ago, I had the privilege of observing and participating for two weeks in an indigenous teacher education course in the Amazonian rainforest of Brazil. This course, sponsored by the Comissão Pró-Indio do Acre (CPI), and held every summer (i.e. January-March) since 1983, was attended this year by some 25 *professores indios*

[1]A slightly revised version of this paper, but with the same title, has been accepted for publication in *Language in Society*, 27 (4), December 1998.

(indigenous teachers), representing 8 different ethnic groups whose languages are in varying stages of vitality, from those with about 150 speakers to those with several thousand.[2]

One of the striking features of the course is that the *professores indios* are simultaneously learners and teachers-in-formation; that is, they are simultaneously learning the school curriculum themselves for the first time, while also preparing themselves to return to their *aldeias*, or communities, to teach it. Another feature of the course is the emphasis on reflexive practice, epitomized in the keeping of class diaries during the school year, a practice which some of the *professores indios* have employed since 1983.[3] A third striking feature is the clear language-as-resource orientation, used here in Ruiz' sense.[4] The language-as-resource orientation in the CPI course means that the indigenous languages are not only encouraged and used as medium and subject of instruction in both the course and the schools, but that the *professores indios* encourage and exchange among each other across their different languages. One activity of the course in which all three of these features converge is the *professores indios'* authorship of teaching materials in the indigenous languages which are reflective of indigenous culture, history, and artistic expression; these materials serve as documentation of the *professores'* own learning as well as serving as a teaching resource for their work in their own classrooms.

The curriculum covered during the two weeks I observed was Mathematics, Portuguese Language and a new curricular area, Introduction to Research, being taught for the first time. In the latter area, one group of *professores* was learning to write proposals to gain funding for research and/or for community development. The most popular topic for proposals proved to be projects of linguistic or cultural revitalization, and among those who developed a proposal along those lines was Antonio Arara, a Shawandawa. In the introductory part of his proposal, Antonio describes the rapid diminution of his language, noting that as a result of many years of contact and conflict with white people, the Shawandawa now number only 196,[5] with only 6 native speakers of the language, all over the age of

[2]The ethnic groups represented in the course I observed are, in order of total estimated # of speakers from greatest to smallest:
Asheninca or Kampa - of which there are only 560 in Brasil, but 55000 in Peru
Kaxinawá - with 2700 in Brazil and another 1200 in Peru
Apurinã - 2800
Jaminawá - 370 in Brazil and 600 in Peru,
Katukina - 650
Arara or Shawandawa - 300
Yawanawá - 230
Manchineri - 152
(CEDI/Instituto Socioambiental 1994).

[3]See Nietta Monte (1996) for a description and analysis of the diaries.

[4]Here and throughout this paper, I and the authors I cite follow Ruiz (1984) in referring to language-as-resource, language-as-right, and language-as-problem orientations.

[5]His number differs somewhat from the figures in CEDI/Instituto Socioambiental 1994, which lists 300 Shawandawa, all of them in Acre.

60. He goes on to recount that beginning in 1990 he has been involved with Comissão Pró-Indio (CPI) staff in linguistic research and that in 1996 they produced the first primer in Shawandawa, which although still incomplete is already yielding good results with the schoolchildren. His proposal is to do more tape-recording, writing and publishing in Shawandawa, so that the next generation can be taught the language. In introducing this strategy in the face of the dismal picture of language loss with which he opens his proposal, Antonio asserts optimistically: "Temos uma saída!" 'There is a way out!' (1/23/97)

LANGUAGE POLICY, INDIGENOUS LANGUAGES, AND VITALITY

Shawandawa, also called Arara, is one of many indigenous languages around the world in danger of disappearing because they are not being transmitted to the next generation. The plight of endangered languages is considered by many to be a crisis. In an oft-cited article published in 1992 in *Language*, Michael Krauss estimated that as few as 600 of the estimated 6000 languages on earth will remain secure through the next century (1992:7). While we lack an accurate assessment of the situation of endangered languages in most areas of the world (Grenoble and Whaley 1996:210), we have approximate figures for enough cases to make the point quite convincingly. For example, of the 175 indigenous languages still extant in the United States, only 20 are being transmitted as child languages (Krauss 1996, as cited by McCarty 1996:1). In the state of California, which bears the dubious distinction of having the most endangered languages of any part of North America, of 100 Indian languages spoken at the time the Europeans arrived, there are today only 50 still spoken, most only by elders; and virtually 100% of California's indigenous languages are no longer learned by children (Hinton 1994).

Nor is this only an "American problem"; indigenous languages around the world are undergoing similar pressure. To name just a few examples: a recent paper by Brenzinger identified 16 languages in Ethiopia confronting the imminent possibility of extinction (Grenoble and Whaley 1996:211; see also Brenzinger 1992); and a report prepared in 1995 for the European Commission by Peter Nelde, Miquell Strubell, and Glyn Williams, and entitled *Euromosaic*, considers the current situation of 48 minority language groups in the European Union, and in particular "their potential for production and reproduction, and the difficulties which they encounter in doing so." The report looks at the "implications of the more general process of political and economic restructuring within the EU for minority language groups," and argues that given "the shift in thinking about the value of diversity for economic development and European integration, attention must be given to sustaining the existing pool of diversity within the EU" (Nelde et al. 1996: Executive Summary).

Over the last decade, endangered languages have received increasing

scholarly attention, in publications (e.g. Hale et al. 1992) and conferences, as for example a February 1995 conference held at Dartmouth and reported in the *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* by Lenore Grenoble and Lindsay Whaley (1996); and an October 1996 conference on Endangered Languages, Endangered Knowledge, Endangered Environments, held in Berkeley, California, also saw the founding of a non-profit non-governmental international organization, Terralingua, devoted to preserving the world's linguistic diversity, and to investigating parallels and links between biological and cultural diversity.

Parallels are drawn between endangered languages and endangered species; in each case, the endangered ones, as journalist James Crawford writes, "fall victim to predators, changing environments, or more successful competitors," are encroached on by "modern cultures abetted by new technologies," and are threatened by "destruction of lands and livelihoods; the spread of consumerism, individualism, and other Western values; pressures for assimilation into dominant cultures; and conscious policies of repression" (Crawford 1994:5). Yet, as Grenoble and Whaley assert, despite a recognition of some "commonality to the general circumstances that bring about language endangerment, ... [it is] regionally specific, or even community-specific, factors [that] dictate the ultimate effect of these circumstances" (Grenoble and Whaley 1996:211). Among the latter, they suggest, is the factor of how a particular language community may react when confronted with imminent language loss; specifically, whether or not the community can or will mobilize resources to counteract the loss.

Joshua Fishman calls such activities Reversing Language Shift or RLS, and argues that RLS cannot be successful without intergenerational language transmission; "nothing," he says, "can substitute for the rebuilding of society at the level of ... everyday, informal life" (1991:112). In a collection of essays I recently edited, paired or co-authored contributions by scholars, and members or native speakers of various indigenous language communities in North, Meso- and South America describe efforts to maintain and revitalize their languages through the use and development of various literacies. In the volume's concluding essay, I suggest that the striking characteristic of the efforts described is their bottom up nature: from the curriculum development work with the Yup'ik of Alaska described by Jerry Lipka, Esther Ilutsik, and Nastasia Wahlberg, to the book publication project of Oaxaca, Mexico described by Russ Bernard, Jesús Salinas, and Josefa Gonzalez, to the Guarani literacy campaign in Bolivia described by Luis Enrique López, and many more, it is "the involvement and initiative of the indigenous communities themselves that ... provide the impetus and sustenance for language planning efforts" (Hornberger 1996:357).

Antonia Arara's rallying statement above, "Temos uma saída," is another example of that kind of bottom up response - and is indicative of the incredible initiative, energy, and enthusiasm indigenous people may put into revitalization efforts when they feel their language or culture are threatened, efforts most often based around literacy and education.

His statement is also, indirectly, evidence of the role that national language and education policy can have in encouraging or dampening such enthusiasm. In the Brazilian case, the Constitution of 1988 marks a significant turning point in policy for the indigenous populations. Brazil's 1988 Constitution recognizes, for the first time, the Indians' social organization, customs, languages, beliefs, and traditions, and their native rights to the lands that they have traditionally occupied (Brasil, *Constituição*, 1996, Chapter VIII, Article 231); the Constitution also ensures that education in the indigenous communities will make use of their own native languages and learning processes (Brasil, *Constituição*, 1996, Chapter III, Article 210). In 1993, the Brazilian Ministry of Education appointed a Committee on Indigenous Education, which serves in an advisory capacity to the Ministry and has formulated a set of policy guidelines for indigenous education (Comite, 1994). The revitalization efforts of the *professores indios*, in conjunction with the Comissão Pró-Indio, occur in the context of this political opening toward recognition of the Indians and of their rights to their languages and to education in their languages.[6]

Such a political opening was also the impetus for one of the first *major* indigenous bilingual education initiatives in South America, the Puno Bilingual Education Project , which I and others have described at length elsewhere. In that case, it was the 1975 recognition of Quechua, alongside Spanish, as official languages of Peru, that paved the way for the Puno bilingual education project which served approximately 4% of the school-aged Quechua and Aymara speaking population of the Department of Puno throughout the 1980s, developed the first complete set of bilingual primary education materials in an indigenous language in Latin America, and has served as a model, inspiration, and resource for bilingual education initiatives in Latin America in the 1990s (Hornberger and López in press; López 1997).

One such 1990s initiative is that of Bolivia,where indigenous language speakers make up 63% of the population, and where major language and education policies are being introduced that have significant consequences for indigenous language maintenance and revitalization. The Bolivian National Education Reform of 1994 envisions a comprehensive transformation of the educational system - including the introduction of all 30 of Bolivia's indigenous languages alongside Spanish as subjects and media of instruction in all Bolivian schools. Teaching/learning modules are being developed by native speakers for all the languages: those for Quechua and Aymara draw on the experience of the Puno and other experimental bilingual education projects carried out in Bolivia, Peru, and Ecuador in the 1970s and 1980s; while those for Guarani draw on the experience gained

[6]The 8 ethnic groups represented at the CPI course are only a few of the 206 indigenous peoples of Brasil (see CEDI/Instituto Socioambiental 1994).

in a successful participatory literacy campaign carried out in 1992-93 (Lopez 1996). Work in the other indigenous languages is at present comprised largely of orthographic and lexical development, carried out through a partnership approach between young, informed speakers of the languages and academic specialists appointed by the indigenous communities to work on their languages; this work had originally been slated to start in the year 2002 with the second phase of the Bolivian Reform, but political pressure from the Amazonian and East Andean indigenous groups advanced it to the first phase. The Bolivian Education Reform, undertaken in conjunction with the Popular Participation Process also launched in 1994, constitutes the institutional cement for the construction of a new Bolivian State in which pluralism is seen as a resource and not a problem (Lopez 1995: 87).

Post-apartheid South Africa's new Constitution (Act No. 200 of 1993) also embraces language as a basic human right and multilingualism as a national resource, diverging from its former language-as-problem orientation (cf. Chick 1996). The Constitution raises nine major African languages to national official status alongside English and Afrikaans;[7] and states that: "every person shall have the right to use the language of his or her choice" (section 31); that "no person shall be unfairly discriminated against, directly or indirectly, on the grounds of language" (section 8); that "each person has the right to instruction in the language of his or her choice where this is reasonably practicable" (section 32); and that "each person, wherever practicable, shall have the right to insist that the State should communicate with him or her at national level in the official language of his or her choice and at provincial level in any provincial official language" (section 3) (Department of National Education n.d.). The Language Plan Task Group, appointed in December 1995 to advise on the development of a national language plan, is working at the level of subcommittee and national consultation (Department of Arts, Culture... 1996). The Pan South African Language Board, mandated by the Constitution and established in March 1996, is charged with responsibility for promoting multilingualism through such measures as: the development and promotion of equal use of the official languages; the provision of translation services; and the promotion of respect for and development of other languages used by communities in South Africa, e.g. Indian languages and German (Chick 1996:3). Though only in the beginning stages, the impact of this new language policy has already begun to be felt in the schools, which are not only rapidly desegregating due to the end of apartheid, but also confronting the opportunities and challenges of bilingual and multilingual education (PRAESA, 1995).

In the USA, the 1990 and 1992 Native American Languages Act declares that the U.S. government's policy is to "preserve, protect, and promote the

[7]The nine languages are: Ndebele, Northern Sotho, Southern Sotho, Swati, Tsonga, Tswana, Venda, Xhosa, and Zulu, all of which already had regional official status somewhere in South Africa.

rights and freedom of Native Americans to use, practicè, and develop Native American languages" (P.L. 101-477, Section 104[1]). Terri McCarty reports that "though meagerly funded, [this Act] has supported some of the boldest new initiatives in indigenous language revitalization, including language immersion camps and master-apprentice programs in which elderly speakers team with younger tribal members over months and years in natural language learning activities" (McCarty 1996b:13).

There is no question, then, that language policies with a language-as-resource orientation can and do have an impact on efforts aimed at promoting the vitality and revitalization of endangered indigenous languages.

Of course, this is not to say that protecting indigenous languages is simply a matter of declaring a language policy to that effect. There is ample evidence that that is not so. For one thing, there may be other, conflicting policies that inhibit the effect of the language-as-resource policy. After all, in the United States, we not only have the Native American Languages Act, but also the proposed Language of Government Act, which, if enacted, would designate English as the official — and sole permissible — language of U.S. government business, with only a few exceptions. We will return to this below.

Additional obstacles to protecting indigenous languages simply by declaring policy are: the well known gap that is nearly always present to one degree or another between policy and implementation, and the fact that policies may change or get over-ruled. From today's vantage point looking back, it is clear that both these things happened in the case of the 1975 Quechua Officialization in Peru; not only was there a lack of government follow-through in terms of budgetary and institutional support for Quechua officialization, but also, in the years subsequent to 1975, Peruvian policy retreated somewhat from the resource orientation to a language-as-right orientation, providing attention to Quechua language maintenance, but not necessarily to its development and extension (Hornberger 1988a, 1988b; Hornberger and López to appear; López 1997).

Finally, there is what I will call, for lack of a better term, the force of history, which may overwhelm any policy attempt. It is worth noting in this regard that while I formulated my dissertation research, in the early 1980s, around the question of Quechua language *maintenance* (Hornberger 1988a) my student, Kendall King formulated her dissertation research, in the early 1990s, around the question of Quichua language *revitalization* (King 1997). To be sure, part of this change can be attributed to different histories in Peru and Ecuador, to different language maintenance and loss trajectories in different Quechua speaking communities throughout the Andes (cf. Grenoble and Whaley 1996 on regional specific and community specific circumstances), and even perhaps to different theoretical or experiential outlooks in different researchers, but at least part of the change is also attributable, I think, to a growing threat to even such a large indigenous language as Quechua, with its estimated 10 million or more speakers.

We will return to this point later.

LANGUAGE EDUCATION, IMMIGRANT LANGUAGES, AND VERSATILITY

As we make a transition to the topic of immigrant languages and language education, and before we move from the southern to the northern hemisphere, let me begin, as before, with a short vignette from my own recent experience, this time in Durban, South Africa, last June.

As I noted above, South Africa's new Constitution elevates nine African languages to national official status alongside English and Afrikaans, while also providing for the promotion of respect for and development of other languages used by communities in South Africa. Among those "other languages" are the languages of India. Approximately 40% of the population of Durban is of Indian and Pakistani origin, said to be one of the largest Indian populations outside of India, and constituting a presence dating from 1860 when the first indentured laborers from India arrived to work on the sugar plantations. Under apartheid, Indians formerly had their own separate educational system with English as medium of instruction; I visited one formerly 100% Indian secondary school, which now has an approximately 25% African student body, though still a 100% Indian teaching staff.

Among those attending a talk I gave at the University of Natal were several faculty from the Department of Indian Languages at the University of Durban-Westville, who introduced themselves to me and told me something about their work. In particular, Dr. Varijakshi Prabhakaran was anxious for me to know that, despite the widespread perception that Indians in South Africa all speak English and that the Indian languages have all but disappeared, there are in fact significant numbers of speakers of the Indian languages, as well as significant language maintenance and language revitalization efforts ongoing. In her view, the Indian languages are oppressed minority languages in South Africa, the more so now that there are nine official African languages along with English and Afrikaans.

Varija's plea, on behalf of the immigrant Indian population, for attention and support for Indian languages in South Africa is echoed around the world by immigrant voices who seek to maintain their languages in the face of seemingly irresistible social, political, and economic pressures to assimilate to the language and culture of their new country. In my experience, this plea is matched in intensity by the complementary plea for opportunity to learn the new country's language as well. In other words, the plea of immigrants is that they ought to be enabled to learn and use the new language, but also to keep and use their own language, the 'old' language, in their new country. [Sort of along the lines of a song from my childhood, that went - "Make new friends but keep the old, one is silver and the other gold."] This twin plea is, in my view, a remarkably consistent one around the world; yet, equally remarkable and consistent around

the world, it seems that the immigrants' new country often seeks to force a choice for one or the other language, or worse still, lets both pleas fall on deaf ears.

Marcelo Suarez-Orozco has recently drawn our attention to similarities in the immigrant experience in the US and Western Europe, similarities which set the context for the assimilatory pressures mentioned above. He notes that, in both cases, the causes of recent increases in immigration, and in particular in undocumented immigration, are primarily three:

> 1) policies which aim at recruiting foreign workers to feed a voracious appetite for inexpensive labor;
>
> 2) a reliance by some sectors of the market on foreign workers to do the impossible jobs nobody wants to do, even with high unemployment among native workers; and
>
> 3) stunning global economic and political transformations (e.g. NAFTA in the US and political upheaval and the spread of ethnonationalistic conflicts in Europe).

He goes on to note that in both Western Europe and the US, similar, and largely unfounded, concerns characterize what he observes as a growing anti-immigrant sentiment, namely:

> 1) concern that there are just too many new arrivals;
>
> 2) the belief that limits on immigration have largely failed to contain the undocumented immigrants and asylum seekers;
>
> 3) anxiety about the economic consequences of immigration;
>
> 4) the explosive charge that immigrants contribute disproportionately to problems of crime;
>
> 5) a general anxiety that new arrivals are transforming the demographic landscape; and
>
> 6) a pervasive anxiety that new immigrants are not easily assimilating.
>
> (Suarez-Orozco 1996).

As we know all too well, it is this kind of xenophobia, however ill-founded, that leads to policies such as California's Proposition 187 adopted in 1994 and the proposed Language in Government Act, currently before the U.S. Congress.[8] This Act, which would require that English be used by "all employees and officials of the Government of the United States while performing official business," has been characterized by Senator Paul Simon as a "not very subtle symbolic attack" on Hispanic and Asian Americans, a reading even further reinforced by proposed amendments which would exempt "the use of [both] indigenous and foreign languages in education" from this English-only mandate (James Crawford, Update on English-only legislation - IV, 9 March 1996).

Richard Ruiz tells us that "movements toward the officialization of English in the United States are consistent with the tendency in large multinational states to promote a transethnified public culture" (Ruiz 1996:1). He differentiates transethnification from assimilation, in that in transethnification, it is not necessary to lose one's ethnicity to be useful to the state, ... nor is it necessary ... that one's attachment to the state have any sentimental aspect (in Kelman's (1971) sense of historicity and authenticity)" (1996:1). In the U.S., Ruiz suggests, languages other than English are "perfectly acceptable ... [but only] as long as they are mediated through individuals and not communities; [however] if they are community languages, they should be confined to the private sector and not make demands for public subsidy; [and] if there is to be public subsidy, their use should be for the common public good, and not signal competing allegiances" (1996:3).

In a language ideology built, as Ruiz suggests U.S. and other multinational states' language ideologies are, on the promotion of transethnification, instrumentalism, and nationism, it is difficult to find room for state-supported programs of language education that would promote the full use and development of two or more languages in school and lead to the kind of bilingual / biliterate / bicultural versatility encapsulated in the immigrants' twin plea to learn the new and keep the old. Yet, my own work and my reading of others' work on language and education policy and practice for immigrant (and other) language minorities in the U.S. and elsewhere has led me to formulate a couple of principles which propose just that:

The first principle, drawn as an implication from my continua model of biliteracy, is that the more the contexts of their learning allow bilingual/biliterate learners to draw on all points of the continua of biliteracy, the greater are the chances for their full biliterate development. That is, the

[8]Approved as H.R. 123 on 1 August 1996 and introduced in the Senate as S. 356 in the 104th Congress (1995-96), this bill was re-introduced in the 105th Congress as H.R. 123 on 7 January 1997 and as S. 323 on 13 February, but so far "appears to lack influential backers" (James Crawford, Update on English-only legislation - IX, 4 March 1997). The text of the version passed by the House in 1996 can be found on the World Wide Web at: http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/4?c104:./temp/~c104t60x::

contexts of their learning must allow learners to draw on oral-to-literate, monolingual-to-bilingual, and micro-to-macro contexts; productive and receptive, oral and written, and L1 and L2 skills; with both simultaneous and successive exposures, and attention to both similar and dissimilar aspects of language structure, and convergent and divergent aspects of language scripts (Hornberger 1989, 1990, 1992).

In a multi-year ethnographic dissertation study of women and girls in several Cambodian refugee families in Philadelphia, Ellen Skilton Sylvester notes that "the challenges many [Cambodian] women and girls face in learning to read and write English are often seen in relation to short schooling histories in Cambodia, differences between Khmer and English, and little exposure to reading and writing in their first language" (1997:vii). Although her study addresses these issues, she places the onus of responsibility on "educational policies and practices [that] often treat the Cambodian students' native language as a problem rather than a resource, and provide few opportunities for these students to practice and learn the literacy skills needed to become "literate insiders" in the United States" (1997:vii).

Using the continua model of biliteracy as a "tool for uncovering the aspects of literacy that influence participation in educational programs by Cambodian women and girls," Skilton Sylvester suggests that in addition to the continua of biliterate contexts, development, and media that my model proposes, the continua of *content*, the meaning or "inside" of literacy (as compared to media, the structure, or the "outside" of literacy), are an additional key dimension, particularly so for an understanding of how it is that these Cambodian women and girls remain literate "outsiders", rather than "insiders" (1997:187). By content, Skilton Sylvester refers to "what is taught through and about reading and writing as well as what is read and written" (1997:242), and she defines it in terms of majority-minority, literary-vernacular, and parts-whole continua. For these Cambodian women and girls, being "outsiders" has to do with whether and to what degree literacy contents they are introduced to in their classes include serious attention to Asian voices and experience (i.e. a range of minority as well as majority contents), to the kinds of literacies they practice in their daily lives - e.g. the reading of romances; or the writing of letters, stories, and plays (i.e. a range of vernacular as well as literary contents), and to reading and constructing whole texts as well as performing rote memorization, drills, and fill-in-the-blank exercises (i.e. a range of parts to whole language contents).

Skilton Sylvester applies micro-level understandings of the meanings and uses of literacy among these Cambodian women and girls to the analysis and critique of macro-level language and education policies for language minorities in schools and adult education classes. She shows how current practices often leave Cambodian women and girls "in-between," pulled in two directions by the home and the classroom; and points to a different possible kind of "in-between" where schools and adult education

programs would be "'in-between" sites that value and respond to learners' daily lives *and* teach what they need to know to become insiders in the United States" (1997:vii).

What she is talking about is exactly the kind of support for bilingual/biliterate/bicultural versatility that pleas like Varija's call for. In my own work on mother tongue literacy in the Cambodian community of Philadelphia, I found telling evidence that an interest in preserving Cambodian language and culture does not preclude the learning of English or acculturation to American ways; quite the contrary. It was precisely the individuals who practice Cambodian literacy and who have a clear sense of specific functions for Khmer literacy - as an aid in learning English, a skill for employment, a vehicle to preserve Cambodian language and culture in a new land, or an essential for going back to Cambodia to help people there - who also work hard to learn English, who express a general appreciation for all languages, who seek to negotiate a way of life that harmonizes their old and new cultures, and who reach out to improve intercultural communication between Cambodians and Americans (1996b: 83). It is this kind of versatility which is essential for immigrants and their languages not only to survive but to thrive and contribute to their new land.

The second principle that my work and my reading of others' works has led me to formulate with regard to educational policy and practice for immigrant (and other) language minority learners is that the specific characteristics of the optimal contexts for their learning can only be defined in each specific circumstance or case; there is no one "program", or even three programs, or ten, or twenty, that will necessarily provide the best learning context for all biliterate learners.

To be sure, there is accumulating consensus, in both research and practice, that enrichment models of bilingual education, i.e. those which "aim toward not only maintenance but development and extension of the minority languages, [toward] cultural pluralism, and [toward]an integrated national society based on autonomy of cultural groups" (Hornberger 1991:222) offer much potential for both majority and minority learners' academic success. Canadian French immersion programs are one example of such a model, two-way bilingual education is another; but there are most certainly other program types which could embody an enrichment model of bilingual education, whose "primary identifying characteristic is that the program structure incorporate a recognition that the minority language is not only a right of its speakers but a potential resource for majority language speakers" (Hornberger 1991: 226).

Yet, the specifics of how a program actually incorporates that recognition will vary greatly depending on each context; and we need many more in-depth studies and descriptions of such programs before we can begin to understand "what works" and doesn't work and why. One two-way bilingual education program for which we have a detailed description is the Oyster School in Washington D.C. , one of the oldest two-way programs in

the U.S. In the early 1990s, at the time of Rebecca Freeman's ethnographic / discourse analytic study, the Oyster School's population was 58% Hispanic, 26% White, 12% Black, and 4% Asian, representing over 25 countries (Freeman 1996:558); and the school's language plan, then as now, provided for instruction in Spanish and English for both majority and minority language speaking children. Freeman began by looking at patterns of language use in this bilingual school and ended by discovering that curriculum organization, pedagogy, and social relations were shaped by a larger underlying identity plan. Her original intention was to study the two-way bilingual education language plan by triangulating classroom observations, the school's bilingual education policy, and conversations with principals, teachers, and students of the school.

However, she began to find that there was not in fact strictly equal bilingualism in the school - that codeswitching to English in Spanish class was common, but not the reverse; that there was district-wide testing in English, but not Spanish; that the English-dominant students were not as competently bilingual in Spanish as the Spanish-dominant were in English. At that point, she began a more open-ended search for 'what was going on.' What she found was that the success of the program was due not so much to the school's language plan, but rather to their underlying identity plan, i.e. the school community's "attempt to provide the students not only with the ability to speak a second language, but in the case of the minority students, techniques for asserting their right to speak and to be heard in a society that, at least in the Oyster School construction, regularly refuses minority populations such rights" (Freeman 1993:107).

"The right to speak and be heard." This brings us to the third and final section of my talk, which I will again introduce with a short vignette from my own recent experience.

LANGUAGE RIGHTS, INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES, AND STABILITY

In conjunction with the Sociolinguistics Symposium 11 held in Cardiff last September, I made my first visit to the site of some of my own ethnic roots, in North Wales on the Isle of Anglesey. While there, I visited Caernarvon, famous not only as the site of the castle where the Prince of Wales is crowned (an English, not a Welsh, event), but also as the place in the world where the most Welsh is spoken. It is also the headquarters for CEFN, a Welsh non-party citizens' movement which seeks equality of citizenship and equality for Welsh people as a nation and for the Welsh language. Eleri Carrog, founder, told me about how the organization grew out of a 1985 nation-wide petition movement to combat the misuse of the

[9]The misuse of the Race Relations Act was in the Jones and Doyle case, where the Race Relations Board had successfully supported English language applicants against Gwynedd County Council, who wished to appoint a bilingual assistant in a Welsh old people's home.

Race Relations Act[9] and support the right of employers to recruit bilingual speakers to give service in a bilingual community. That petition drive was the original impetus for a movement which has grown far beyond the founder's expectations, with CEFN becoming an unofficial legal aid system for those wishing to fight authority to establish language rights. CEFN and others engaged in the campaign for Welsh language rights have met with some success with the 1993 passage of the Welsh Language Act.

It is not only Welsh speakers who have become activists for the right to use their own language. Language rights, or linguistic human rights, have taken on increasing urgency worldwide in the light of the twin threat posed by the loss of vast proportions of the world's linguistic resources - the endangered languages; and by the growth of world languages such as English.

Within the last decade [and going on fifty years since the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted unanimously by the United Nations General Assembly in 1948], two UNESCO-supported conferences [one held in Recife in October 1987 and another in Paris in April 1989] have called for a Universal Declaration of Language Rights which would "ensure the right to use the mother tongue in official situations, and to learn well both the mother tongue and the official language (or one of them) of the country of residence" (Phillipson 1992:96). Since 1985, the Working Group on Indigenous Populations of the United Nations' Commission on Human Rights has been developing a draft Universal Declaration on Indigenous Rights, which includes among some 28 rights of indigenous peoples:

> "The right to maintain and use their own languages, including for administrative, judicial, and other relevant purposes; [and] The right to all forms of education, including in particular the right of children to have access to education in their own languages, and to establish, structure, conduct, and control their own educational systems and institutions" (Alfredsson 1989:258).

In sum, these declarations call for the right to education in one's own language AND the right to a significant degree of control over the educational process as it affects one's children. Stephen May argues for both these rights for indigenous minorities and offers the case of Maori education in Aotearoa / New Zealand as an example where such rights have led to developments in which "a long and debilitating history of colonization and marginalization for Maori is being contested, and Maori language and culture [is being] reasserted" (May 1996:154). In a situation where Maori language was "all but ... banned from the precincts of the schools" from the turn of the century on (1996:157), and was in rapid decline especially

after World War II on (1996:158), May notes that "two recent educational developments have begun to halt the process of language loss for Maori: first, the establishment of bilingual schools in the late 1970s; and second, and more significantly, the emergence of alternative Maori-medium (immersion) schools - initiated and administered by Maori - during the course of the 1980s" (1996:160). Alternative, Maori-controlled, Maori-medium education began at the pre-school level in 1982 with the Te Kohanga Reo, or 'Language Nests', and has grown to a movement including not only primary schooling in the Kura Kaupapa Maori (literally 'Maori philosophy schools'), but also secondary and tertiary level institutions. Furthermore, since 1990, both Te Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Maori have been incorporated into the state educational system as recognized (and state-funded) alternative education options, (a situation which, as May notes, is not without some contradictions with respect to the notion of relative autonomy which has been so fundamental to the movement, cf. 1996:164). As of 1991, 1% of Maori primary school students were enrolled in Kura Kaupapa Maori; while as of 1993, 49.2% of Maori children enrolled in pre-school were at a kohanga reo.

Terri McCarty, Jerry Lipka, Galena Sells Dick and their co-contributors to a 1994 theme issue of the *Journal of American Indian Education* tell of similar success stories in American Indian / Alaska Native education, where local knowledge has successfully become a genuine foundation for indigenous schooling, as a result of decade-long, collaborative efforts by native speakers and non-native educators. In a concluding essay to that volume, I suggested that among the enabling conditions for such sustained and lasting improvements in indigenous schooling, as gleaned from their experience as well as the case of the Puno bilingual education project which I studied, are: a vital native language valued by the community, versatile bilingual / bicultural / biliterate personnel who take the lead in effecting change in their schools, and long-term stability of the change site - stability of site personnel, governance, and funding (Hornberger 1994b: 62)

CONCLUSION: LANGUAGE-AS-RESOURCE POLICY / LANGUAGE POLICY AS A RESOURCE

The language-as-resource orientation in language planning, as first discussed by Richard Ruiz (1984), is fundamental to the vision of language policy, language education, and language rights I have presented here; but in concluding, I want to emphasize that it is not an uncomplicated, conflict-free vision of language-as-resource that I have in mind.

I suggested that language policy with a language-as-resource orientation can and does have an impact on efforts aimed at promoting the vitality and revitalization of endangered indigenous languages, and it is in this sense that I believe we can speak of language policy itself as a resource. At the same time, however, I noted that the force of history may overwhelm any policy attempt, even in the case of such a large indigenous language as

Quechua.

My notion of the force of history appears to be similar to what Aodán Mac Póilin, writing about the Irish Language Movement in Northern Ireland, has recently called linguistic momentum, that is, "the forces which ensure that a language is used in society and passed on from one generation to the next." He notes that the same linguistic momentum "which allowed Irish to survive against enormous pressures in pockets of the country is now working in the other direction, in favor of English, and is, in spite of the best efforts of the revivalists, effectively inhibiting the development of Irish as a community language outside the Gaeltacht" (1996:2, 5).

After all, it is not the number of speakers of a language, but their positioning in society, which determines their patterns of language use. Mac Póilin talks about this in terms of the relative linguistic significance of groups of speakers, which he says is related less to the number of speakers than to the degree to which the language is integrated into the daily life of its users, their social coherence, and - most importantly if the language is to survive - the community's ability to successfully regenerate itself as a speech community" (4).

The whole notion of language minority has more to do with power than with numbers, anyway.[10] However, if it is true that our language and literacy practices position us in social and power hierarchies, it is also true that they may be sites of negotiation and transformation of those hierarchies. In a recent essay on research on bilingualism among linguistic minorities, Marilyn Martin-Jones notes that the conflict research tradition seeks to explain how and why languages come to be functionally differentiated, in terms of a social history of inequality, while the micro-interactionist research tradition sees "individuals within a bilingual community ... as actively contributing to the definition and redefinition of the symbolic value of the languages within the community repertoire in the context of daily conversational interactions" (Martin-Jones 1992).

An example of the kind of negotiative and transformative action individuals within a bilingual community can take are the bottom up revitalization efforts I mentioned earlier. Of fundamental importance here is that these revitalization efforts are not about bringing the language back, but rather about bringing it forward. As Kendall King and I note for the Quechua case, "when we consider that reversing language shift entails altering not only the traditional language corpus but also how it is traditionally used, both at the micro level in terms of inter-personal discourse patterns, and at the macro level of societal distribution, the crucial importance of the involvement of speakers of the language becomes even more apparent. In a very real sense, revitalization initiatives ... are not so much about bringing a language back; but rather, bringing it forward; who better or more qualified to guide that process than the speakers of the language, who must and will be the ones taking it into the future?" (Hornberger and King 1996:440). May also emphasizes this point when he clarifies that the movement for alternative, Maori-medium education is "neither separatist nor a simple retrenchment in the past" (164); rather, he says, it revolves around a question of control, of having Maori-medium education available as a legitimate schooling choice and he reminds us that "nothing in the assertion of indigenous rights - or minority rights more generally - precludes the possibilities of cultural change and adaptation" (164).

[10]May puts it this way: "Although the term 'minorities' tends to draw attention to numerical size, its more important reference is to groups with few rights and privileges (see Byram, 1986; Tollefson, 1991) " (May 1996:165); and Nelde et al. note that "the concept of minority by reference to language groups does not refer to empirical measures, but rather, to issues of power" (Nelde et al., 1996: 1).

Furthermore, it is not only language minority community members, but also language education professionals who can be active contributors to negotiative, transformative processes of language revitalization, language maintenance, or indeed language shift; there is increasing recognition in our field of the role of language education professionals as language policy makers - whether they be classroom practitioners, program developers, materials and textbook writers, administrators, consultants, or academics (cf. Hornberger and Ricento 1996). Teresa McCarty has gone so far as to argue in a recent paper that, "while schools cannot in themselves 'save' threatened indigenous languages, they and their personnel must be prominent in efforts to maintain and revitalize those languages" (1996b:1). In this regard, and again from a language-as-resource perspective, I suggested earlier that key considerations for the education of indigenous, immigrant, and other language minorities are bilingual / bicultural / biliterate versatility, the continua of biliteracy, and enrichment model bilingual education.

Here, too, though, I do not mean to suggest that the implementation of a language-as-resource perspective offers a conflict-free solution. In our finite world, the recognition and incorporation of multiple languages within any one educational system is bound to bring the language rights and needs of one group into conflict with another at some point in time, not to mention the long-standing conflict between language and content priorities in the education of language minorities. A recent dissertation by Angela Creese looks at the limits and successes of a UK language policy that aims to provide for the language rights and needs of bilingual children in multicultural schools through mainstreaming the children while providing them with in-class language support, an approach with which we are also familiar in the United States. Using an ethnographic interpretive methodology, Creese observed and audio-recorded Turkish bilingual teachers and Anglo English as a second language teachers and the subject teachers they were working with in their classrooms. She looked at the relationships the teachers formed, the roles they played in class, and the language they used in playing these out, and found that, within the constraints imposed by the educational aims and reality of current policy, the language rights of the

children rarely became a priority alongside the content-based aims of secondary education. Although the teachers showed great versatility in forming a range of collaborative relationships (which Creese names support, partnership, and withdrawal), if they attempted to change the hierarchy of educational aims, they were often challenged by the children they were helping; while teachers who worked "outside this hierarchy of aims [were] not only in danger of working themselves out onto the periphery in terms of their own status in the school, but [could] also be seen by the children they [were] targeting as providing a deficit form of education" (1997:2). Creese concludes that "there is much more that can be done to celebrate rather than tolerate [the] diversity in British schools" (1997:322). I mention this case here not to single out UK policy for criticism, but to illustrate a point that holds true for many language policies around the world, namely that a serious commitment to provision of the rights for children to be educated in their own language requires a systemic and systematic effort, which cannot necessarily be handled by an add-on program or policy.

Language rights, then, from a language-as-resource perspective, are not a question of automatic concession-on-demand, but rather of control and choice among potential alternatives, in balanced consideration of other possibilities as well. Elsewhere I have argued that it is crucial that language minorities be empowered to make choices about which languages and which literacies to promote for which purposes; and that in making those choices, the guiding principles must be to balance the counterpoised dimensions of language rights for the mutual protection of all. Among the balances that must be struck across competing language rights are those between tolerance-oriented and promotion-oriented rights (Kloss 1977), between individual and communal freedoms (Skutnabb-Kangas 1994), between freedom to use one's language and freedom from being discriminated against for doing so (Macias 1979), and between claims-to-something and claims-against-someone else (Ruiz 1984) (Hornberger in press). These are difficult ethical choices, but they must be made; I am arguing here that those best qualified to make them are the language minority speakers themselves.

At a time when phrases like "endangered languages" and "linguicism" are invoked to describe the plight of the world's vanishing linguistic resources in their encounter with the phenomenal growth of world languages such as English, I hope that I have convinced you that there is also consistent and compelling evidence that language policy and language education serve as vehicles for promoting the vitality, versatility and stability of these languages, and ultimately of the rights of their speakers to participate in the global community on, and in, their own terms.

I end with one last personal vignette - this one from my home state, California, and indeed, my home county, Marin, even though I was not present at the event. Leanne Hinton, in her 1994 book *Flutes of Fire*, reports on the 1992 Tribal Scholars Language Conference, a gathering of Native

Californian language activists at Walker Creek Ranch in Marin County, one of the outcomes of which was the master-apprentice language program I mentioned earlier. She tells about a conversation she had there with L. Frank Manriquez, a Native Californian artist of Tongva and Ajachmem origins, in which Hinton commented on how inspiring the conference had been even in the face of what appeared to be such a hopeless situation for so many native Californian languages. To which Manriquez responded: "Yes. How can it be hopeless when there is so much hope?" (Hinton 1994: 233).

References

Alfredsson, G. (1989). International discussion of the concerns of indigenous peoples. *Current Anthropology*, 30 (2): 255-259.

Brasil. *Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil (CF/88)* (1996). São Paulo, Brasil: Editora Revista dos Tribunais.

Brenzinger, M. (ed.) (1992). *Language Death: Factual and Theoretical Explorations with Special Reference to East Africa*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Cavalcanti, M. (1996). An indigenous teacher education course in Brazil: Cross-cultural interaction, voices and social representation. Paper presented at University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Education: Language in Education Division Colloquium, November.

Chick, K. (1996). Language policy in the Faculty of Humanities: Discussion Document. Unpublished manuscript. Durban, South Africa: University of Natal, June.

CEDI/Instituto Socioambiental (1994). *Banco de Dados do Programa Povos Indígenas no Brasil*. Brasil: CEDI/Instituto Socioambiental, November.

Comite de Educação Escolar Indígena, Brasil (1994). *Diretrizes para a Política Nacional de Educação Escolar Indígena*. Brasilia, Brasil: Ministerio da Educação e do Desporto (MEC)/SEF/DPEF [Cadernos Educação Básica, Série Institucional, Volume 2], 22 pages.

Crawford, J. (1994). Endangered Native American languages: What is to be done and why? *Journal of Navajo Education*, 11(3):3-11.

Creese, A. (1997). *Partnership teaching in mainstream British secondary school classrooms: A language policy for bilingual students*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Department of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology, South Africa (1996). *State Language Services: Information on the Language Plan Task Group (Langtag)*. April, 8 pages.

Department of National Education, South Africa (n.d.). *South Africa's New Language Policy*. Pretoria, South Africa: Department of National Education, 10 pages.

Fishman, J. A. (1991) *Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Freeman, R. D. (1993). *Language planning and identity planning for social change: Gaining the ability and the right to participate*. Ph.D. dissertation, Georgetown University.

Freeman, R. D. (1996). Dual-language planning at Oyster Bilingual School: "It's much more than language." *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(3): 557-582.

Grenoble, L. A. and Lindsay J. W. (1996). Endangered languages: Current issues and future prospects. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 118: 209-223.

Hale, K. et al. (1992). Endangered languages. *Language*, 68(1): 1-42.

Hinton, L. (1994). *Flutes of Fire: Essays on California Indian Languages*. Berkeley, California: Heyday Books.
Hornberger, N. H. (1988a). *Bilingual Education and Language Maintenance: A Southern Peruvian Quechua Case*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Hornberger, N. H. (1988b). Language planning orientations and bilingual education in Peru. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 12 (1):14-29.
Hornberger, N. H. (1989) Continua of Biliteracy. *Review of Educational Research*, 59 (3): 271-296.
Hornberger, N. H. (1990). Creating successful contexts for bilingual literacy. *Teachers College Record*, 92(2): 212-229.
Hornberger, N. H. (1991). Extending enrichment bilingual education: Revisiting typologies and redirecting policy. In Ofelia García (ed.), *Bilingual Education: Focusschrift in Honor of Joshua A. Fishman on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, 215-234. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Hornberger, N. H. (1992). Biliteracy contexts, continua, and contrasts: Policy and curriculum for Cambodian and Puerto Rican students in Philadelphia. *Education and Urban Society*, 24(2):196-211.
Hornberger, N. H. (1994a). Literacy and language planning. *Language and Education*, 8 (1&2): 75-86.
Hornberger, N. H. (1994b). Synthesis and discussion - Vitality, versatility, stability: Conditions for collaborative change. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 33(3): 60-63.
Hornberger, N. H. (ed.) (1996a) *Indigenous Literacies in the Americas: Language Planning from the Bottom up*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Hornberger, N. H. (1996b). Mother tongue literacy in the Cambodian community of Philadelphia. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 119: 69-86.
Hornberger, N. H. (in press). Literacy, language maintenance, and linguistic human rights: Three telling cases. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*.
Hornberger, N. H. and King, K. A. (1996). Language revitalisation in the Andes: Can the schools reverse language shift? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 17(6): 427-441.
Hornberger, N. H. and López, L. E. (to appear). Policy, possibility, and paradox: Indigenous multilingualism and education in Peru and Bolivia. In Jasone Cenoz and Fred Genesee (eds.), *Beyond Bilingualism: Multilingualism and Multilingual Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
Hornberger, N. H. and Ricento, T. (eds.) (1996). Language planning and policy and the English language teaching profession. Special-topic issue of the *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(3): 397-640.
King, K. A. (1997). *Language revitalization in the Andes: Quichua use, instruction, and identity in Saraguro, Ecuador*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
Kloss, H. (1977). *The American Bilingual Tradition*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.
Krauss, M. (1992). The world's languages in crisis. *Language*, 68 (1): 4-10.
López, L. E. (1995). *La educación en áreas indígenas de américa latina: Apreciaciones comparativas desde la educación bilingüe intercultural*. Guatemala, Guatemala: Centro de Estudios de la Cultura Maya.
López, L. E. (1996). To Guaranize: A verb actively conjugated by the Bolivian Guaranis. In Nancy H. Hornberger (ed.), *Indigenous Literacies in the Americas*, 321-353. Berlin: Mouton.
López, L. E. (1996a). Donde el zapato aprieta: Tendencias y desafíos de la educación bilingüe en el Perú. *Revista Andina*, 14 (2):295-342.

Mac Póilin, A. (1996). Aspects of the Irish language movement in Northern Ireland. Paper presented at the Canadian Association for Irish Studies, University of Prince Edward Island, June.
Macías, R. (1979). Language choice and human rights in the United States. In James Alatis (ed.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics*, 86-101. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
Martin-Jones, M. (1992). Minorities and Sociolinguistics. In William Bright (ed.) *Oxford International Encyclopedia of Linguistics*, 15-18. New York: Oxford University Press.
May, S. (1996). Indigenous language rights and education. In J. Lynch, C. Modgil, and S. Modgil, eds. *Education and Development: Tradition and Innovation* (volume 1), 149-171. London: Cassell.
McCarty, T. L. (1996a). Mother tongue literacy and language renewal: The case of Navajo. Paper presented at the World Conference on Literacy, Philadelphia, March.
McCarty, T. L. (1996b). Schooling, resistance, and American Indian languages. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, San Francisco, November.
McCarty, T. L., Lipka, J. and Sells Dick. G. (eds.) (1994). Local knowledge in indigenous schooling: Case studies in American Indian/Alaska Native education. Theme issue of the *Journal of American Indian Education*, 33(2): 1-63.
Monte, N. L. (1996). *Escolas da Floresta: Entre o Passado Oral e o Presente Letrado*. Rio de Janeiro, Brasil: Multiletra.
Nelde, P., Strubell, M. and Williams, G. (1996). *Euromosaic: The Production and Reproduction of the Minority Language Groups in the European Union*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford University Press.
PRAESA (Project for the Study of Alternative Education in South Africa) (1995). Project Proposal for the establishment of a demonstration school to explore multilingual teaching strategies and for the training of multilingual teacher specialists under South African conditions. Capetown, South Africa: University of Capetown.
Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal*, 8(2): 15-34.
Ruiz, R. (1996). English officialization and transethnification in the USA. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, San Francisco, November.
Skilton Sylvester, E. (1997). *Inside, outside, and in-between: Identities, literacies and educational policies in the lives of Cambodian women and girls in Philadelphia*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1994). The Politics of language standards. Paper presented at TESOL, Baltimore.
Suárez-Orozco, M. (1996). Unwelcome mats. *Harvard Magazine*, July-August, 32-35.

Nancy H. Hornberger is Goldie Anna Professor at the Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania. She specializes in sociolinguistics, language planning, and bilingual education, with special attention to educational policy and programs for language minority populations in Andean South America and the U.S.